

Armenian Miscellanea

ERIC P. HAMP
University of Chicago

eresk^c

The genitive is eresac^c; therefore the final of this plurale tantum should be *-kā.¹ If we are to equate this noun with Greek *πρόσωπα*,² we shall need to derive er- from *proti-. If the formation is that of other nouns for 'face,' the portion following the first element should be *-H_ok^w- (akn).

A sequence *proti-H_ok^wikā, could give *protik^wikā > *φroihiśa- > *roiisa-. This does not promise to yield eresa-. If we resyllabify *protiH_ok^wikā, then we get *proti(i)θk^wikā > *φroiijaħiśa- > *roiiaħiśa-. Again, this not promising. If *φroiijaħiśa- had suffered a kind of haplology, eliminating oi, we would have *φrijaħiśa-; this leads to *ria(ĭ)isa- > *erea(y)sa- > eresa-.

Then the shorter form eres-k^c was vocalized by analogy with the penult vocalism of eresa-.

FOOTNOTES

¹See "The semantics of Armenian plurals." *From Soundstream to Discourse* (Papers from the 1971 Mid-America Linguistics Conference), Columbia, Missouri, 1972, 66-71.

²BSL 68, 1973, 77ff.

asehⁿ

Since the l-stems remain alive in Armenian, we cannot have here a frozen ācc. sg. The formation then suggests an old heteroclite. The vocalism -eġ- suggests a non-neuter, and Greek *ἄκρος*

which cannot be a participial *-ró- suggests a replacement of a moribund animate, shifted to the surviving, *r/n heteroclites; the n-state of the stem is furnished by Ved. *aśáni-h* = Lith. *ašniš*. We recover, then, *asel/asn- < *ak-el/n-, parallel in formation to 'sun'.¹

FOOTNOTE

¹Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies 26, 1975, 97-102.

vařem, vařim

The base vař- 'kindle, burn' cannot be directly equated with Lith. *virti*, OCS. *vrěti variti* etc.¹, since it is clear that the regular reflex for simple initial IE *ǵ is Armenian g². A reflex transcribed v, w must result from some kind of internal (medial) treatment. I have already suggested a solution along these lines for vec^o '6'.³

Meillet (Esquisse 50) has already proposed *(u)wer < *uper for ger i veroy. We may profitably follow that up, along lines of Schmitt Grammatik 76 § 12 X and 189.

Various related forms,⁴ including Greek *ψυ*, show us that IE had a particle base *up-, or *hup- as I would reconstruct it taking into account the Albanian evidence. We therefore propose a compound verb *hup + ur-ne- (:κᾰμνω) 'heat completely, vel sim.' [hup-ur-ne-]. By the IE rule deleting ǵ after labial obstruent, this becomes *(h)upr̥ne- > *uwarne- > waře-. The *r was originally strengthened to r̄ next to *n. If then the trans. *-ur-ne- > *uwarne- > *vařnem and the intrans. *-ur-ē- > *uwari- > *varim lived side by side, the pair was plausibly leveled to vař- with the distinction carried by e : i. The form is too isolated to enable us to say whether the *u- was lost phonetically or by aphaeresis, since the syntactic collocations of *(en+)upéri and *upr̥ne were not identical.

FOOTNOTES

¹See most recently R. Schmitt, *Grammatik des Klassisch-Armenischen*, Innsbruck, 1981, p. 70; *Kratylos* 17, 1972 (1974), 26. Dumézil's suggestion of *v- + ař- does not really explain, but is on the right track.

²See, e.g., J.A.C. Greppin. AAL 2, 1981, 3.

³Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Archibald A. Hill, The Hague: Mouton, 1978, vol. III 81-90.

⁴See *Studia Celtica* 14-15, 1979-80, 106-13, esp. 109 for *ups-.

Locative yamsean

Godel (106 § 5.237) thinks that the locative y-amsean is an "extended form of -i," originating with -st, e.g., in korust gen.-dat.-loc. korstean "loss." But amis (and cnund) have no i forms and are o-stems. Such a form must be explained as a (partial) relic.

We must regard amis amsoy as an old neuter or masculine s-stem (cf. Baltic *mēnes-*), for which we reconstruct the pre-form *sm-mēns-os 'single-moon'; for the construction cf. *Proceedings of the 11th International Congress of Linguists, Bologna 1975*, II 1047-55, esp. 1050 footnote 14.

This locative must then be *sm-mēns-es-ŋ-i > *am-mis-e-an(-i) > amsean. Such a case form must have arisen through the conflation of two stem forms. In the older endingless locative we would have had *sm-mēns-es × *sm-mēns-en > *sm-mēns-esen → *-esŋ-i.

and, ento-cin

This ambiguous preposition may well have multiple sources. Schmitt *Grammatik* 165-6 opts for *en-tos, and this is highly likely because it agrees specifically with Greek *ἐντός*. Unless however we can assume a rule for proclitic vowel reduction, a source directly in *anti is not possible, in view of my argument¹ for and 'illic' from *an + te < *H_aen to-. Note that normal "pretonic" reduction is not proclitic.

Another possible source is *en-dhi, the equivalent of the ancient locative *en-i.² In view of the survival of -j = Greek -θι in Armenian, such a formation is as likely as *en-tos.

A closely related but distinct formation ento-cin has been perceptively analyzed³ by J. Weitenberg. He correctly identifies the initial element as *endV-, equating it with Greek *ἐνδον*. I would

equate the two exactly as *en-do, explaining the Greek as containing n-ephelkystikón and thereby attracted to the paradigm of δῶ (= Arm. tun).⁴ An interesting Celtic analogue to onto-cin is found in Welsh anian, annyan 'nature.'⁵

It seems that Armenian continues traces of *H_een (> i), *H_eentos, *H_een-dhi, and *H_een-do.

FOOTNOTES

¹Papers in Honor of Madison S. Beeler, edd. K. Klar, M. Langdon, and S. Silver (The Hague: Mouton) 1980, 343.

²See my analysis of this group, Eriu 28, 1977, 145-6.

³Annual of Armenian Linguistics 2, 1981, 85-9.

⁴See my analysis Lingua Posnaniensis 20, 1977, 11 footnote 4, and Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie 36, 1977, 9.

⁵I have analyzed this in Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies 16, 1956, 279-80.

cnund

The recoverable paradigm of this noun must be *génont- ≈ *génont-es-ŋ- vel sim. (see amis); pl. *génont-es, acc. *génont-()ns, gen. *génont-o-sko-, instr. *génont-o-bhVs. Alternatively, instead of *génont-es-n- we may have *génont-ia-n-. So much for the phonetics.

Morphologically, the plural *génont- immediately suggests the type of γέρων. The combining form of *génonto-sko- and *-bhVs matches γερωντο-(διδάσκαλος). This all suggests that we should choose for the pre-form of the singular an old abstract *génont-ia-(n-), which may be compared indirectly with γερονσία. Such an abstract-collective gives the nom-acc. *génont-ī > cnund, oblique *génont-iā-. The original derivation here was *génH_e-ont-iH_a to the middle verb cnanim < *génH_e-n-(ē-)(> *gén nē-).